



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/580,179 | 05/26/2000 | Dominique Commereuc | PET-1845 | 8780 |

23599 7590 12/31/2002

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.
2200 CLARENDON BLVD.
SUITE 1400
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

PASTERCZYK, JAMES W

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1755

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/580,179

Applicant(s)
Commereuc et al.

Examiner
J. Pasterczyk

Art Unit
1755



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 18, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 12-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claims 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 7 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1755

1. This Office action is in response to the amendment and IDS filed 10/18/02 and refers to the first Office action mailed 7/18/02.

2. Regarding the restriction requirement, the division was between a composition and a process using the composition, with the process capable of being practiced with another and materially different composition, hence only one way distinctness need be alleged, which is what was done in the original restriction requirement.

3. Since newly-submitted claim 21 is drawn to the same invention as originally elected, it will be examined along with those claims originally examined.

4. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the correct spelling is --cycloalkyl--.

Claim 2 now depends from newly-submitted claim 21, which contains all the material limitations of claim 2, hence claim 2 fails to further limit claim 21.

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-11 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chauvin et al., USP 4,283,305 (hereafter referred to as Chauvin II) in view of Chauvin et al., 5,059,571 (hereafter referred to as Chauvin I).

Art Unit: 1755

The examiner first notes that both Chauvin I and II were assigned to the same assignee as the present application, and that both have at least one common inventor with the present application.

Chauvin II discloses the invention essentially as claimed (col. 1, l. 58 to col. 2, l. 54).

Chauvin II lacks disclosure of mixing the reagents for any particular time or at any particular temperature.

However, Chauvin I teaches that reacting nickel compounds reading on the present claims with aluminum compounds reading on the present claims is conventional (col. 1, l. 42 to col. 2, l. 42). There appears to be no difference between the reaction times and temperatures of Chauvin I and those of the present invention. All that appears to occur in the present invention is the recognition that it takes some time for the nickel catalyst to become fully activated by the aluminum cocatalyst, something that would have been known to the routineer in the art at the time the present invention was made.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teaching of Chauvin I to the disclosure of Chauvin II with a reasonable expectation of obtaining a highly-useful olefin oligomerization catalyst with the expected benefit of the catalyst being more active due to its being allowed to activate more fully.

Art Unit: 1755

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Pasterczyk whose telephone number is (703) 308-3497. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell, can be reached on (703) 308-3823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310 for normal faxes, 872-9311 for after final faxes.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Elizabeth Wood
ELIZABETH WOOD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 1755

Application/Control Number: 09/580179

Page 5

Art Unit: 1755

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Pasterczyk', written in a cursive style.

J. Pasterczyk

12/30/02